UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/995,239	11/27/2001	Yumman Chan	CA920000043US1	9665	
45541 HOFFMAN WA	7590 11/12/200 ARNICK LLC	EXAMINER			
75 STATE ST 14TH FLOOR		STIBLEY, MICHAEL R			
ALBANY, NY	12207	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			3688		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			11/12/2008	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOCommunications@hoffmanwarnick.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/995,239	CHAN ET AL	
Examiner	Art Unit	
MICHAEL R. STIBLEY	3688	

	WIGHT CETT. OT BEET	0000					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 29 October 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.				
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two months	s of the date of				
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered be	cause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor							
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	w);						
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet _ appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		•	_				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) rejected:		l be entered and an ex	৻planation of				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a).				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered buse <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>	t does NOT place the application ir	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
13. Other:							
/Michael Stibley/	/James W Myhre/						
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3688	Supervisory Patent Exa	miner, Art Unit 3688					

Continuation of 11: Applicant's remarks of 10/29/2008 have been considered, although Examiner refers Applicant to the office action of 10/17/2008, as the Examiner is not persuaded in view of these recent remarks. In Applicant's remarks of 10/29/2008, Applicant contends that SKEEN does not teach a decision graph; Examiner refers Applicant to previous office action and in addition notes that SKEEN teaches a Real-time Decision Support System relying on decision trees/graphs for responding to queries. A decision begins with a query and with each possible initial query, this is an entry point in said decision tree/graph. Thus if a decision support system begins with multiple possible queries, it begins with multiple possible entry points. Thus, despite Applicant's contentions, SKEEN teaches Multiple Entry Points. Regardless, It is well known in the art to provide multiple entry points within decision support systems such as decision graphs/trees. Further, while multiple entry points are not expressly disclosed in MATTERN, MATTERN does teach leaps, which can be interpreted as reentry into the decision graph and a re-entry, where re-entry, given broadest reasonable interpretation is an entry. Thus MATTERN, given broad reasonable interpretation also discloses multiple entry points. Applicant further contends that interim solution is not addressed. Examiner refers Applicant to the previous office action and points out once again that MATTERN teaches a series of proposed solutions; The word series, indicates multiple solutions, or a building up of solutions, in which case, there would have to be an interim solution, before the final solution is reached. It is apparent to a person having ordinary skill in the art that Interim Solution of Allowance.